

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
*See* Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

JAN 19 2012

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2011-0187
	)	DEPARTMENT B
Appellee,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
JOHN ANTHONY LANOZA,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COCHISE COUNTY

Cause No. CR200900225

Honorable Wallace R. Hoggatt, Judge

AFFIRMED

DeRienzo & Williams, P.L.L.C.  
By Daniel J. DeRienzo

Prescott Valley  
Attorneys for Appellant

K E L L Y, Judge.

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant John Lanoza was convicted of three counts of knowingly possessing a forged instrument with the intent to defraud and one count of possession of a narcotic drug. The trial court sentenced him to an enhanced, presumptive, 4.5-year prison term for each offense, to be served concurrently. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State*

*v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), stating he has reviewed the record and has found no “error or arguable questions of law” to raise on appeal. Counsel has asked us to search the record for fundamental error. Lanoza has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s finding of guilt. *See State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). The evidence presented at trial showed that after Lanoza stopped at a border patrol checkpoint, he was arrested pursuant to an outstanding warrant, and, during an inventory search of his vehicle, officers found drug paraphernalia, hydrocodone, and copies of United States’ currency. Counterfeit bills with the same number had been “passed” at several locations in the area. We further conclude the sentence imposed is within the statutory limit. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-701; 13-703(I); 13-2002(C); 13-3408(A)(1), (B)(1).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, Lanoza’s convictions and sentences are affirmed.

/s/ *Virginia C. Kelly*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ *Garye L. Vásquez*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Presiding Judge

/s/ *Philip G. Espinosa*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge